
This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Re-sounding a partisan (micro)politics?

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<http://edinostcall.alessiomazzaro.com/2018/11/15/re-sounding-a-partisan-micropolitics/>

PUBLISHER

Alexandros Delitanassis

VERSION

VoR (Version of Record)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Whiteley, Gillian, Geoff Bright, and Walt Shaw. 2019. "Re-sounding a Partisan (micro)politics?". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/37145>.

Introduction

Why Voice and Matter Matter

Oscar Hemer & Thomas Tufte

In *Why Voice Matters – culture and politics after neoliberalism* (2010), British media scholar Nick Couldry pointed to the lack of means for people to voice their opinions under neoliberalism. He accused the media of, in fact, reinforcing neoliberal values. But, perhaps most importantly, he also claimed that gaining voice is not enough – neither for social change, nor for other visions of society to thrive. While voice, and the polyphony of concepts related to it – such as participation, agency, activism, narrative and artistic expression – is fundamental in any vision of democracy and a fair society, it is absolutely vital for those whose lives depend on the material conditions of development and social change. For them, gaining and exercising voice relates directly to critical matters like education, infrastructure, transportation, health services, food security and environmental damage.

When we chose Voice & Matter as the overarching theme for the fourth *Ørecomm* Festival, we deliberately paraphrased Couldry, who by the way had been one of the keynote speakers at the second *Ørecomm* Festival (*Reclaiming the Public Sphere*, 2012), playing with the double meaning of ‘matter’. We find the pairing of Voice and Matter to be an apposite metaphor for the interdisciplinary field of theory and practice that we commonly call Communication for Development.¹ By attempting at re-positioning this yet emerging cross-discipline, we have been obliged to revisit our previous inventory of the field, *Media and Glocal Change: Rethinking Communication for Development* (2005). The decade between these publications appears, in fact, as an intriguing time frame for analysis of the dynamic between Voice and Matter, as mirrored in the makeover of the field itself.

Media and Glocal Change was launched in September 2005 at a meeting at the University of the Philippines in Los Baños, which aimed at founding a global university network. Twelve universities, including Malmö and Roskilde, contributed to the event and signed the Los Baños Statement.² That initiative, driven by the Rockefeller Foundation funded Communication for Social Change Consortium, was one of many in what seemed to be a new momentum for media and communication in development cooperation, in the run-up to the first World Congress on Communication for

Development (WCCD) in Rome, 2006.³ But the anticipated breakthrough did not occur. The Rome congress was a major achievement in the sense that it managed to assemble more than 800 practitioners and scholars. Yet it was ensued by a peculiar backlash, first and foremost in the area of development cooperation. FAO, one of the three organizers,⁴ even demoted their C4D department after WCCD, and it has only recently been revitalized. Another of the organizers, the World Bank, also closed down most of their ComDev work shortly after the Rome congress, when their principal donor, the Italian government, pulled out. Within the UN-system there is however one noteworthy exception to this gloomy scenario. UNICEF, which always played a significant role in ComDev, has in recent years strengthened and consolidated its position as world leader in the institutionalized practice of ComDev.

The university network from Los Baños did not evolve as expected, either, although many important bilateral contacts have come out of it, such as the long-standing pedagogic collaboration between Malmö University and the University of Guelph. And although the Communication for Social Change Consortium today is only a vague shadow of what it was a decade ago, the development of university curricula in Communication for Development and Social Change did eventually take off, most significantly in the Spanish-speaking world, with MAs and BAs popping up both in Spain and across Latin America. Good examples of this late development are seen in Paraguay, Peru, Colombia and Ecuador.⁵ The UK has likewise experienced a significant boom in curriculum development, with MAs at SOAS, University of London, London School of Economics, and the universities of East Anglia, Sussex, and Westminster. Other initiatives have emerged with institutional support from professional organisations, such as the MA programmes developed with the support of UNICEF in India, or the ones with a strong practitioner-oriented profile under the heading of 'social and behaviour change communication' (SBCC), supported by the US American NGO Academy for Educational Development (AED), in Albania, South Africa and Guatemala. But what remains missing in the academic world is a strong orientation towards research.

The emerging research field in communication for development has in the past decade yielded a growing number of anthologies and special issues of journals, not least two thematic issues of *Nordicom Review* (2012 and 2015). We have ourselves been engaged in this process, along with many others. The main function of these anthologies has been to reinvent the field, both consolidating it and opening it up to new issues and challenges. As for more comprehensive studies that have gone deeper into the conceptual debate, the theory-building and epistemological inquiry of the field, significant contributions have only begun to emerge in quite recent years (Sparks 2007; Quarry & Ramirez 2009; Manyozo 2012; Scott 2014; Enghel 2014; Stenersen 2014; Thomas & Fliert 2014; Tuftte 2014; 2015). Altogether, the past decade can be seen as a bumpy, contradictory and difficult-to-grasp pathway – with significant fall-outs amongst the otherwise promising practitioner institutions; with the growing but still insignificant establishment of the field in the world of university teaching, and with

the slow evolution of ComDev as a research field *per se*. Nevertheless, a new impetus seems to be in the making.

A new momentum

The above described momentary fall-out of the field after 2006 incidentally coincided with the veritable explosion of social media and smart phones⁶ and the subsequent emergence of new forms of social mobilization, which were to take the world, and not least the development industry, by complete surprise in 2011. At the IAMCR⁷ conference held in Istanbul in July 2011, at the height of what was still referred to as the Arab Spring, the role of the social media in the new social movements was discussed in almost every panel. But, as we have previously noted (Hemer & Tufte 2012; 2014), these world-shattering occurrences were rarely, if at all, associated with Communication for Development. Hence, ironically, when at last the crucial potential role of media and communication in social change processes became evident to everyone, the dominant institutionalized field of Communication for Development, with its roots in the post World War II diffusion of modernization enterprise, was obviously bypassed, unable to seize the momentum. The other significant strand of Communication for Development and Social Change, originating in the Latin American tradition of participatory communication, did not grab this event to move forward either. While not being recognized, let alone regarded as relevant to ComDev in the first instance, this startling turn appears in retrospect as a watershed moment, not only for the re-orientation and, possibly, redefinition of the field, but for its scientific deepening and broadening. The urgent need to analyse and understand the new phenomena further underscored the need for new theory and transdisciplinary approaches.

The impetus in current media and communication research on social media, civic engagement, and social movements, has arguably impacted on the discipline of Media and Communication Studies as a whole, pushing it towards less media-centric and more globally oriented perspectives. These new subjects were very present in the mentioned IAMCR conference in 2011, but they simultaneously sparked a lot of attention in other areas within the social sciences; amongst political scientists, (Bennett & Segerberg 2013; Kavada 2011 and 2014; Della Porta & Rucht 2013, to mention a few), media sociologists (Couldry 2014; Gerbaudo & Treré 2015) and a growing number of anthropologists, as we will elaborate further upon below. Development Studies has during the same period tended to move from hard-core economics and social sciences towards a humanities orientation, increasingly focusing on cultural aspects and *representations* of international development and globalization (i. e. Dogra 2012; Lewis, Rodgers & Woolcock 2014). A third tendency, closely connected to and overlapping with the two above, is the rise of Anthropology as principal discipline in the field, at par with Media and Development studies, as can be observed in the prominence of media ethnography and visual and digital storytelling. A gradually growing anthropo-

logical engagement with media and communication practices came in the aftermath of a series of anthologies in the early 2000s (i. e. Ginsburg et al 2002; Murphy and Kraidy 2003), gained further impetus with the rise of global radical activist networks (Juris 2008, 2012) and has obtained particular momentum with the current attention to social movements (i. e. Postill 2014a and b; Barassi 2011 and 2013, Mollerup & Gaber 2015; Pink 2009).

World development

For the larger retrospective analysis of world development in the last ten years, there may be several decisive breakpoints, but the 2008 financial crisis appears as paramount, with its restructuring of the global economic order. Although the BRICS⁸ brand is seriously undermined as we write, with Brazil's economic stagnation and Russia's political *and* economic regression, China's rise to hegemony remains undisputed, with deep-going consequences for international development cooperation. The shortcomings of Neoliberalism, as symbolized by the Argentinean meltdown in 2001, has paved the way for what Jan Nederveen Pieterse (2008) called "the return of the development state", and typically not a democratic one. New aspiring economies in Asia and Africa no longer look to the West for role models, but to East Asia. China as a new hegemon has the significant advantage of not bearing the legacy of colonial master. North-South donor-recipient relationships are increasingly giving way for more and less equal South-South collaboration, as the agency of development shifts from the former metropolitan centres to former developing countries (Pieterse 2010). On a global scale, the most dramatic transformation in recent years, besides the implosion of the Middle East, is no doubt Sub-Saharan Africa's makeover in the global imaginary, from disaster-stricken continent of no hope to the new frontier of world capitalism, with a number of *lion economies* tailing the East Asian tigers.

Parallel to, but also far earlier than these moments of global economic and political crisis, a long-standing questioning of the Western development discourse has gained new impetus. The fundamental critique concerns the narrow focus on economic growth, the centrality of market logics, the lack of concern for social consequences, and the absence of sustainable long-term considerations. Amongst the most prominent critical voices is Indian economist and philosopher Amartya Sen who already in the 1980s and '90s worked with the concept of a "capabilities approach", defining development as "a process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy" (Sen 1999: 293). There have been many other scholars, mainly from within the broad postcolonial literature, not only critiquing and questioning the Western development discourses, but also providing a range of other ways to conceive of development – ranging from the Bhutanese notion of 'Gross National Happiness' and Latin American notions of Good Living, *Buen Vivir* (Sousa Silva 2011), to radical revisions of the African "post-colony" (Mbembe 2001; Chasi 2014). The Portuguese scholar Boaventura de Souza

Santos (2014) summarizes these many new takes on development as ‘epistemologies from the South’. Surprisingly, and sadly, the field of ComDev has paid little attention to these discussions, as compared to the emphasis put on communication and media. Hence, in the light of the current radical rethinking, in particular these epistemologies from the South, a moment of opportunity has arisen for the revision and strengthening of the ‘Dev’ part of ComDev.

As demonstrated above, most of what we regard as the academic renewal of the field has happened within specific scientific disciplines and amongst researchers who do *not* see themselves as communication for development scholars. They do however represent the issues and disciplines that have come to mark the territory from which Communication for Development now re-emerges with stronger epistemological stands and with more clear notions of what theories to draw upon. Reasserting its truly inter- and multidisciplinary character, Comdev continues struggling with differing approaches and perspectives, whilst digging both deeper and broader into the humanities and social sciences, and not least into anthropology.

The ethnographic turn

The subtitle of this anthology, *Communication, Development and the Cultural Return*, indicates a pre-eminence for culture in this deepening and broadening scientific reorientation. That may at first glance seem like old news. The 1980s and ‘90s saw a *cultural turn* in the social sciences, as expressed for example in the ‘qualitative turn’ of audience studies within media and communication research. Already in 1988, the US American media scholar James Lull spoke of ethnography as an “abused buzzword”, indicating the inflation in using this notion amongst media and communication scholars who engaged with qualitative audience research, while anthropologists, with a few exceptions, yet had to discover media and communication studies.

The cultural turn within the social sciences at that time also impacted on development cooperation and, not least, communication strategies. In the post-war Modernization paradigm, culture had been regarded as an obstacle to development, a vestige of tradition and “backwardness”, and development communication was precisely – and merely – a tool to enhance development, i. e. modernization and economic growth. The momentary, never hegemonic, Dependency paradigm of the 1970s opposed the dominant, diffusionist and technocratic Rostow Doctrine,⁹ but retained the socio-economic frame of analysis and a firm belief in state intervention and developmental policies. Communication was still merely an instrument to this end. The cultural turn brought, however, a reaction to both these paradigms. With the focus shifting from the development state to the local community, communication became more than simply an instrument for persuasion and individual behaviour change; it was increasingly regarded as a *process* of democratization and empowerment and hence an end in itself. The monolithic model for modern development was challenged by

the plurality of culture-sensitive *alternative development*, or dismissed altogether, as in the post-development debate mentioned above (i. e. Escobar 2012[1995]; Rahnema & Bowtree 1997; Ferguson 1990, Illich 1991).¹⁰ Although top-down diffusion models for behavioural change prevailed, *participatory communication* became the new buzzword, if not the new paradigm, at the turn of the millennium. It was in part based on the revival of the Latin American strand of participatory theory and practice, which had a strong influence on critical social science of the 1970s. A key scholar and source of inspiration was Brazilian liberation pedagogue Paulo Freire, with his focus on “conscientization”, dialogic communication and revolutionary pedagogical practices (Freire 1970).¹¹

Ironically, the critique of development “from below”, and from within the proper field of theory and practice, coincided with the hegemony of Neoliberalism in the global economy with its dismissal of development politics, at national or regional level, as obstacles to the market logic; according to which global capitalism will eventually bring universal benefits for all, unless it’s inhibited by protectionist or other particularistic measures, will eventually bring universal benefits for all. This “unholy alliance” of interests can be seen, if you like, in the commercialisation and privatization of development aid, with increasing focus on celebrities. The notion of *Live Aid* goes back all the way to the 1980s,¹² but the prominence of celebrities as ambassadors for the development industry is something that has largely crystallized in the last decade (Richey & Ponte 2011), and so is the rise of corporate philanthropy to leading positions in the donor league. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has in its first fifteen years grown to the largest private foundation in the world and one of the major players in global health care and poverty reduction, especially in Africa. In the current third or fourth stage of the digital revolution, we are witnessing a veritable Scramble for Africa and other emerging markets between, on the one hand, Microsoft, Google and Facebook, and on the other, China, India, Brazil and, of course, the former colonial powers in new disguise.

‘Voice’ and ‘Matter’ are not synonymous with ‘communication’ and ‘development’, but the concepts are similarly interrelated, and one can detect a fluctuating primacy of one before the other. Within the field of communication for development, there has been a shift from the primordial focus on development (matter) in the early years of both theory and practice (far up into the 1980s) to one on communication (voice), not as merely a tool but as a process (from top-down diffusion to bottom-up participation), mostly in scholarship but also implemented in development cooperation from the mid ‘90s. Now the pendulum seems to be swinging back. Culture clearly has a crucial part in this dynamic, as discussed above. Culture in development context has however tended to become synonymous with identity and identity politics. As much as it may have promoted community participation and empowerment, the privileging of *cultural diversity*, i. e. what the UN World Commission on Culture and Development (1995) defined as “the right of a group of people to follow a way of life of its choice”, arguably also hampers social change by regarding culture as a bounded group identity

to be protected and preserved.¹³

The cultural turn has in recent years been supplemented by a “material turn” in the social sciences; that is, a growing interest in the importance of artefacts, natural forces, and material regimes to social practices and systems of power (Mukerji 2015). The new focus is, more specifically on “the methodological value of studying *materiality* for illuminating under-examined forms of social life—particularly the lives of non literate or suppressed groups” (Ibid., emphasis added). Voice and matter hence converge in this approach, as what we choose to call *the ethnographic turn*.

ComDev in the margins

Although differing and sometimes contradictory, the tendencies and currents above speak in favour of the field of ComDev, albeit not in its conventional hands-on conception of communication *for* development. In our broad, culturally oriented understanding, ComDev is rather the analysis, at meta-level, of the interplay and convergence between communication *and* development (voice and matter). Perhaps it is in fact only now that ComDev is beginning to come of age as a problem-oriented academic field of research in its own right. Simultaneously, partly as a consequence of this reorientation but mostly because hard-core development issues are gaining renewed priority in marginalized areas of the globalized world, we may be seeing a resurgence of the original DevCom; that is, the strategic, solution-driven communication practices with roots in agricultural extension.¹⁴

These seemingly oppositional tendencies mirror in a way the field’s constitutive tension between theory and practice, academics vs. practitioners, and there is not necessarily any contradiction. Colombian media scholar Clemencia Rodriguez, one of the keynote speakers at the IAMCR conference in Montreal in July 2015, advocates the notion of *media at the margins*, a concept and approach which may apply to remote rural communities as well as transnational activist networks. Instead of focusing on media technologies, Rodriguez suggests that we look at the appropriation of media at grassroots’ level. With examples from the geographic margins of Colombia, as well as the Occupy movement in the US, Rodriguez underlined in her IAMCR address how some of these grassroots’ initiatives have developed “idiosyncratic media pedagogies” based on local languages and aesthetics. Rather than looking for linearity and homogeneity, she says, we should focus on processes of cross-pollination, adaptation, hybridization, and replication, which are often visible in grassroots media.¹⁵

What Rodriguez is suggesting ties well in with the ethnographic turn we are proposing. On the one hand, the focus on appropriation of media resonates scientifically with the “qualitative turn” in audience studies in the late 1980s (Jensen 1991), although their focus was less on grassroots media and more on audiences of mainstream media. It ties well in with the more recent resurgence of a “practice approach” as spearheaded largely by anthropologists working with media studies (Bräuchler & Postill 2010),

where the analytical focus of media appropriation lies in studying the actual everyday practices. Moreover, Rodriguez' focus on "cross-pollination, adaptation, hybridization, and replication" ties well in with another current focus area within anthropology, namely *communication ecologies* (Altheide 1995; Slater & Tacchi 2002; Tacchi 2006). However, the explicit emphasis on communication practices, ecologies and environments, suggests perhaps a rephrasing to "*communication at the margins*", whereby, as we have suggested above, the attention moves away from the media and towards the social practice which communication entails.

As for the element of "the margins" it may signal the grassroots level, but more fundamentally, it also speaks to the symbolic or physical distance to power. Thus, it emphasizes the interests of the most marginalized citizens of the global polity.¹⁶ In relation to Communication for Development, we find the margins to be a strikingly relevant metaphor. ComDev is thriving at the margins, both in theory and practice. When (if) "participatory communication", "empowerment" and "social justice" become buzzwords in the hegemonic development speak, there is really reason for caution; not only due to the devaluation of the concepts, but because the institutional logic itself tends to be counter-productive and even destructive. There are innumerable examples of NGOs and other agencies that, albeit well meaning, quell rather than incite citizens' own initiatives (Quarry & Ramirez 2009). As ComDev scholars and practitioners, we must be open to the possibility that ultimately the main obstacle to change may be the development industry itself. In the last ten years, innovation has primarily, if not exclusively, come from the margins – from social movements and other forms of citizen-driven initiatives. Whether this will eventually even render "international development cooperation" obsolete is too early to say. What we do state is that the players in the field of institution-driven communication for development are challenged to reinvent themselves in a world where transnational (glocal) media and communication practices are fundamentally redefining social dynamics and social relations.

The structure of the book

The contributors to this anthology, who were all participants in the 2014 Voice & Matter conference, substantiate our arguments above: the new momentum for ComDev in times of social media and social movements; the close interdependency of voice and matter; the renewed cultural impact in the form of an "ethnographic turn"; and, finally, an approach to the field as from and at the margins. Altogether, it is our conviction that the 17 chapters that follow are substantial contributions to a continuing articulation and re-definition of the theoretical foundation of Communication for Development.

We have organised the book in three sections. Section 1, **Reframing Communication in Culture and Development**, offers the opportunity to revisit our understanding

of communication, embedding it in a theoretical framework of culture *and* development. The anthropological chord that resonates through the entire volume is struck already in the first chapter, where Francis B. Nyamnjoh, using encounters in and with Africa as example, demonstrates how communication studies and anthropology as social sciences are mutually entangled in the struggle for and production of meaning in a world of interconnecting hierarchies. Linje Manyozo helps in the following chapter to deconstruct notions of (postcolonial) development by putting Frantz Fanon's colonial subject in dialogue with Gayatri Spivak's "subaltern" in an analysis of marginalized groups' contestation of oppressive power relationships.

Stefania Milan takes us to the world of digital activists to explore how their struggle for justice, equality and transparency is based on core activist values that ultimately will help recontextualize our understanding of "voice" and "matter", showing that the everyday means of communications are not neutral, and arguing that technology ultimately embodies a moral dimension.

While a large body of literature in the field tends to focus on the opportunities for voice and agency, the materiality – the politics, economics and infrastructure – of social change and development is often overlooked or at best underestimated. Karin Gwinn Wilkins and Kyung Sun Lee unpack the political economy of the development industry, offering an overview of the key donor countries and agencies and the potential implications of the currently changing scenario. Susanne Schech focuses on the specific role of volunteers in development cooperation, subjected to both foreign policy interests and neoliberal management structures of the governments that fund them, but at the same time offering voice in multiple manners.

We conclude the first section on a cultural studies note, with a conversation between Anders Høg Hansen, Faye Ginsburg and Lola Young about the legacy of Stuart Hall and its possible implications for the field of ComDev. This conversation took place after a public screening of John Akomfrah's film *The Stuart Hall Project* (2013) in which Hall reflects on culture, identity, social change, and the movements and ideas that he inspired and was inspired by.

Section 2, **Ethnography and Agency at the Margins**, presents a variety of case studies that in different ways emphasize the role of ethnography in exploring agency and citizen engagement at the margins. Firstly, Jo Tacchi offers a very grounded study on how voice can be conceived and misconceived within the complexities of everyday life, in this case in a low income area of New Delhi, India. It points us to the necessity of understanding the contexts in which we study voice.

Staying in India, Sheela Patel's discussion on the mobilization of the urban poor in informal settlements, in Mumbai and other cities, highlights the example of the transnational grassroots organisation Shack/Slum Dwellers International, which has served as inspiration for Arjun Appadurai's reflections on the "capacity to aspire", to be discussed in-depth in the third section.

Andrea Cornwall is also drawing on an Indian case in her chapter. Based on a critical review of films telling stories of sex workers in India, Cornwall's chapter explores the

politics of these representations and how such films speak to a set of larger questions about development intervention. The chapter reflects on the complexities of development communications in an age of global connectivity.

Sharath Srinivasan and Claudia Abreu Lopes' chapter takes us to Africa, presenting findings from a Zambian case study examining how and why African audiences engage in growing numbers in local radio shows through mobile phones. They critically reappraise what kinds of engagement count in communication for development, what kinds of 'publics' audiences in interactive shows constitute and how we should understand the power of these 'audience-publics'.

Faye Ginsburg unpacks a powerful experience of what she terms "television sovereignty" in contemporary Australian Indigenous Media. Through the drama series *Redfern Now* Ginsburg uses a historical lens focused on experiments with Australian Aboriginal television in remote communities beginning in the 1980s, to further explore contemporary developments in the neighbourhood of Redfern. It was historically the urban center of Aboriginal political action, and has now become an innovative site of cultural activism both on and off screen.

Pegi Vail connects media practices to the scholarship on development, tourism studies, and the anthropology of tourism. She does so by offering an analysis of the trajectory of her own documentary film, *Gringo Trails*, over a two year period. The analysis catalyses a discussion on the role of long-term, ethnographic filmic observation and research in exploring globalization processes.

The third and final section engages with **The Return of The Politics of Hope**; that is, whether and how hope informs citizen engagement and struggles for freedom, equality and justice. The section is based on a conversation between anthropologists Ronald Stade and Arjun Appadurai around "the capacity to aspire". While Appadurai acknowledges his debt to both Amartya Sen's capabilities approach and the more expanded philosophical dimension articulated by Martha Nussbaum, Stade advocates Ernst Bloch's "principle of hope" as a challenging notion. In direct response to the conversation, Nigel Rapport, Gudrun Dahl and Thomas Hylland Eriksen, give their critical reflections upon Appadurai's notion of hope, and specifically the understanding of poverty as an atrophy of hope. Rapport refutes Appadurai's cultural approach which allegedly turns the human capacity to aspire into a question of cultural difference, Dahl warns against blaming the victims of poverty, and Eriksen suggests that it is those living in abundance, rather than the poor, who lack the capacity to aspire.

All three sections of this book hence end with open-ended, unfinished conversations, and we wish to regard that as more than a mere coincidence. The world is in a state of transition, and communication for development, which strives to both explicate and, actually, change the world, is by definition at the crossroads of disciplines and practices of knowing. Our humble hopes are that we have brought some new topics and strands to these conversations, and even led them in some new directions.

Notes

1. There are many nominations in this field. Development Communication (DevCom) is the conventional generic term in North America (and the Philippines), whereas European, Australian and Latin American universities commonly refer to the field as Communication for Development (ComDev, C4D; sp. Comunicación para el desarrollo). Communication for Social Change was for many years a competing concept, promoted by the CfSC Consortium, and the rather clumsy Communication for Development and Social Change (abbreviated CDSC) has lately been used as a generic term.
2. http://www.communicationforsocialchange.org/pdfs/university_network_statement_en.pdf
3. A parallel endeavour, also initiated by the CfSC Consortium, was the *Communication for Social Change anthology* (Gumucio-Dagron and Tufté 2006), a volume gathering fifty years of thinking in this field, represented by some two hundred articles, as excerpts or in extenso, many of which had previously only been published in Spanish.
4. The other organizers were The World Bank and the Communication Initiative, <http://www.cominit.com>
5. Most recently, the Universidad Estatal de Milagro in Quito, Ecuador, has approved an MA program in communication for social change, opening in 2016 CIESPAL, in Quito as well, is also planning an MA, in 'political communication and development'.
6. Facebook was founded in 2004, and the first iPhone was launched in 2007.
7. International Association of Media and Communication Researchers.
8. The acronym BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China), coined in 2001, was adjusted to BRICS in 2010, after the inclusion of South Africa.
9. US Economic Historian Walt Rostow was one of the leading advocates of the Modernization paradigm. In his hugely influential *The Stages of Economic Growth* (1960), he launched the aeronautical analogy of "take off" for the moment in a country's political and economic maturation, "the old blocks and resistances to steady growth are finally overcome".
10. For a comprehensive overview and critical analysis of the post-development school, see Ziai 2007 and Nederveen Pieterse 2010 [2001].
11. In the 'Communication for Social Change Anthology' (Gumucio-Dagron and Tufté 2006) the strong Latin American significance in this field becomes evident: more than 40 percent of the contributions were Latin American, selected based on thematic relevance.
12. It started on the initiative of Irish rock musician Bob Geldof with the *Band Aid* charity campaign for the victims of starvation in Ethiopia 1984 (the record *Do they know it's Christmas?*) culminating in a concert on Wembley 13 July 1985.
13. See our introduction in Hemer and Tufté 2005: 17
14. DevCom, as an abbreviation of Development Communication, is the concept used by University of the Philippines in Los Baños, one of the oldest academic programmes in the field, founded by legendary Nora Quebral in 1972.
15. Clemencia Rodríguez keynote address is available on youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HjTWxnBbKbU> (accessed 10 November 2015)
16. A number of recent publications by IAMCR members have recently dealt with media and the margins, i e Savigny 2015a and 2015b.